



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/815,114

03/30/2004

Stacey R. Rowlan

50847.00105

6573

23619

7590

06/11/2008

SQUIRE SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
TWO RENAISSANCE SQUARE, 40 NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE
SUITE 2700
PHOENIX, AZ 85004-4498

EXAMINER

WILSON, YOLANDA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2113

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/815,114	Applicant(s) ROWLAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Yolanda L. Wilson	Art Unit 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 10-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5,10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Prabhu (USPN 6983398B2) in view of Arimilli et al. (US Publication Number 20040111653A1) in further view of Mathieu et al. (US Publication Number 20020004918A1). As per claims 1,5, Prabhu discloses performing the first self test process in response to a first actuation of a test control; performing the second self test process in response to a second actuation of the test control prior to lapse of a first predefined period of time; and wherein the third actuation is maintained for more than a second predetermined period of time in column 3, lines 22-27 and in column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 32.

Prabhu fails to explicitly state a user of the system initiate the test control in order to perform the first self test process.

Arimilli et al. discloses this limitation in paragraph 0117.

Prabhu discloses a processor executing a program for testing itself. Arimilli et al. discloses self testing of processor during manufacturing of the processor that is ‘initiated by the user, the operating system, or the hypervisor’. It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art to have the self testing of the processor in Prabhu initiated by a user initiating the self testing as disclosed in Arimilli et al. Using the known technique of user initiated testing would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill.

Prabhu and Arimilli et al. fails to explicitly state terminating the second self test process in response to a third actuation of the test control by the user of the system.

Mathieu et al. discloses this limitation in paragraphs 0033-0037.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have terminating the second self test process in response to a third actuation of the test control by the user of the system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have terminating the second self test process in response to a third actuation of the test control by the user of the system because a user controls testing in order for the appropriate aspects of the processors are tested.

3. As per claims 2,11 Prabhu discloses wherein the test control provides a one-bit binary signal having an actuated state and a non-actuated state in column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 32.

4. As per claims 3,12, Prabhu discloses wherein the fourth actuation is maintained for less than the second predefined period of time in column 5, lines 29-58.

Prabhu and Arimilli et al. fail to explicitly state advancing a presentation of test information in response to a fourth actuation of the test control by the user of the system during performance of the second self test process.

Mathieu et al. discloses this limitation in paragraphs 0033-0037.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have advancing a presentation of test information in response to a fourth actuation of the test control by the user of the system during performance of the second self test process. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have advancing a presentation of test information in response to a fourth actuation of the test control by the user of the system during performance of the second self test process because a user controls testing in order for the appropriate aspects of the processors are tested.

5. As per claim 4, Prabhu discloses wherein the first self test process performs legacy functions of the system and the second self test process performs extended functions of the system in column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 32.

6. As per claim 10, Prabhu discloses a first processor that performs a first self test process in response to a first actuation of a provided test control by a user of the system; and a second processor that performs the second self test process in response to a second actuation of the test control prior to lapse of a first predefined period of time wherein the third actuation is maintained for more than a second predetermined period of time in column 3, lines 22-27 and in column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 32.

Prabhu fails to explicitly state a user of the system initiate the test control in order to perform the first self test process.

Arimilli et al. discloses this limitation in paragraph 0117.

Prabhu discloses a processor executing a program for testing itself. Arimilli et al. discloses self testing of processor during manufacturing of the processor that is 'initiated

by the user, the operating system, or the hypervisor'. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the self testing of the processor in Prabhu initiated by a user initiating the self testing as disclosed in Arimilli et al. Using the known technique of user initiated testing would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill.

Prabhu and Arimilli et al. fails to explicitly state terminating the second self test process in response to a third actuation of the test control by the user of the system.

Mathieu et al. discloses this limitation in paragraphs 0033-0037.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have terminating the second self test process in response to a third actuation of the test control by the user of the system. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have terminating the second self test process in response to a third actuation of the test control by the user of the system because a user controls testing in order for the appropriate aspects of the processors are tested.

7. As per claim 13, Prabhu discloses wherein the first processor further performs legacy functions of the system in column 5, line 64 – column 6, line 32.

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prabhu in view of Arimilli et al. in further view of Tran (US Publication Number 20060273929A1). As per claim 14, Prabhu and Arimilli et al.. fail to explicitly state wherein the first processor performs a traffic collision avoidance function and the second processor performs a terrain collision avoidance function.

Tran discloses this limitation on pages 1-2, paragraph 0009.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the first processor perform a traffic collision avoidance function and the second processor perform a terrain collision avoidance function. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have the first processor perform a traffic collision avoidance function and the second processor perform a terrain collision avoidance function because traffic collision avoidance and terrain collision avoidance are types of applications used to prevent collisions in specific devices.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5,10-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Please see the above rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yolanda L. Wilson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3653. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yolanda L Wilson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2113